



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,678	03/19/2004	Saverio Carl Falco	BB1037USCNT	9737
23906	7590	01/25/2007	EXAMINER	
E I DU PONT DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY LEGAL PATENT RECORDS CENTER BARLEY MILL PLAZA 25/1128 4417 LANCASTER PIKE WILMINGTON, DE 19805			MCELWAIN, ELIZABETH F	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1638				
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/25/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/804,678	FALCO ET AL.	
	Examiner Elizabeth F. McElwain	Art Unit 1638	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 39-53 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 39-53 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/19/04</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed November 8, 2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-38 have been cancelled.

Claims 39-53 are newly submitted.

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group II in the reply filed on November 8, 2006 is acknowledged. Newly submitted claims 39-53 are drawn to the elected invention and are examined on the merits in the present Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 39-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The claims are drawn to a chimeric gene comprising a nucleic acid sequence encoding all or a part of a plant lysine ketoglutarate reductase/saccharopine dehydrogenase (LKR/SDH) that is sufficient for use in antisense inhibition or sense suppression to cause an increase level of lysine in seeds of a plant transformed with said chimeric gene. In addition, claims 49-53 are drawn to a chimeric gene wherein the LKR/SDH coding sequence comprises all

or part of SEQ ID NO: 120 that is sufficient for use in antisense inhibition or sense suppression. However, the specification fails to describe the structural features that are essential for LKR activity. Therefore, it remains unclear what constitutes a nucleic acid sequence encoding an LKR or part of the same. In addition, the specification discusses that LKR sequences have homology to saccharopine dehydrogenases (SDH), and sometimes LKR and SDH are in a single bi-functional protein (pages 31-36). However, no information is provided regarding what structural features would confer either type of enzyme activity, and furthermore what sequences would be sufficient for use in antisense inhibition or sense suppression of LKR/SDH.

“A description of a genus of cDNAs may be achieved by means of a recitation of a representative number of cDNAs defined by nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the genus or of a recitation of structural features common to members of the genus, which features constitute a substantial portion of the genus.” In addition, “The name cDNA is not in itself a written description of that DNA; it conveys no distinguishing information concerning its identity. While the example provides a process for obtaining human insulin-encoding cDNA, there is no further information in the patent pertaining to that cDNA’s relevant structural or physical characteristics; in other words, it thus does not describe human insulin cDNA . . . Accordingly, the specification does not provide a written description of the invention”. See *University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co.*, 119 F. 3d 1559; 43 USPQ 2d 1398, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Therefore, given the lack of written description in the specification with regard to the structural and physical characteristics of the claimed compositions, one skilled in the art would not have been in possession of the genus claimed at the time this application was filed.

4. Claims 39-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims are drawn to a

Art Unit: 1638

chimeric gene comprising a nucleic acid sequence encoding all or a part of a plant lysine ketoglutarate reductase/saccharopine dehydrogenase (LKR/SDH) that is sufficient for use in antisense inhibition or sense suppression to cause an increase level of lysine in seeds of a plant transformed with said chimeric gene. In addition, claims 49-53 are drawn to a chimeric gene wherein the LKR/SDH coding sequence comprises all or part of SEQ ID NO: 120 that is sufficient for use in antisense inhibition or sense suppression. However, the specification does not demonstrate that any of the claimed sequences have homology to saccharopine dehydrogenases (SDH), and sometimes LKR and SDH are in a single bi-functional protein (pages 31-36). In addition, the specification discloses that SEQ ID NO: 120 and 122 are not full length sequences (page 34). Therefore, it is even more uncertain that the claimed sequences would encode the portions required to confer LKR activity.

It is well established that sequence homology is not sufficient to predict function of encoded sequences. See the teachings of Doerks (TIG 14, no. 6: 248-250, June 1998), where it states that computer analysis of genome sequences is flawed, and “overpredictions are common because the highest scoring database protein does not necessarily share the same or even similar functions” (the last sentence of the first paragraph of page 248). Doerks also teaches homologs that did not have the same catalytic activity because active site residues were not conserved (page 248, the first sentence of the last paragraph). In addition, Smith et al (Nature Biotechnology 15:1222-1223, November 1997) teach that “there are numerous cases in which proteins of very different functions are homologous” (page 1222, the first sentence of the last paragraph). Also, Brenner (TIG 15, 4:132-133, April 1999) discusses the problem of inferring function from homology, stating that “most homologs must have different molecular and cellular

functions" (see the second full paragraph of the second column of page 132, for example).

Furthermore, Borks (TIG 12, 10:425-427, October 1996) teaches numerous problems with the sequence databases that can result in the misinterpretation of sequence data.

In addition, De Luca teaches that modifying plant biosynthetic pathways by transforming plants with genes encoding enzymes involved in a biosynthetic pathway is highly unpredictable (see the paragraph bridging the columns on page 225N, for example), and that "on many occasions desired goals have been impossible to achieve" (see the last paragraph on page 228N). Therefore, both the identification of other genes encoding LKR/SDH activity, and the modification of lysine levels by transforming a plant with said gene or a portion of said gene are highly unpredictable.

Thus, given the unpredictability of identifying sequences that exhibit LKR/SDH activity and modifying the lysine levels of a plant; the lack of guidance in the specification for identifying and characterizing sequences that LKR/SDH activity; the lack of working examples of LKR/SDH coding sequences to modify lysine levels in a plant, and the lack of working examples of similar sequences that encode proteins having the same activity; and the breadth of the claims, and use of said genes to modify lysine levels; it would require undue experimentation by one skilled in the art to make and use the invention as broadly claimed.

No claims are allowed.

Art Unit: 1638

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth F. McElwain whose telephone number is (571) 272-0802. The examiner can normally be reached on increased flex time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anne Marie Grunberg can be reached on (571) 272-0975. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Elizabeth F. McElwain, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1638

EFM